



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

are given translations of the Armenian fragments, from the Venice edition, from a manuscript at Edschmiazin translated by Mr. F. C. Conybeare, of Oxford, and from Pitra. And while Professor Harris was at work over the Syriac version at Cambridge, Mr. J. Armitage Robinson (editor of these Texts and Studies), while he "was turning over Latin Passionals at Vienna in a fruitless search for a lost manuscript of the Passion of S. Perpetua," happened to recognize "words which recalled the manner and the thought of Aristides" as he was reading portions of the Latin version of the story of Barlaam and Josaphat! That, of course, was a flash-like discovery that the speech of Nachor, in the Greek version of that story, was merely, though indeed, an embodiment, by the Greek redactor and Christianizer of this old Sanskrit story, of the Apology of Aristides into the fable; yet done so neatly, beautifully and masterfully, that the most diligent scrutinizer of the Greek story of Barlaam and Josaphat has never suspected any such embodiment, nor ever thought of anything more than a fresh or original Greek composition. And this, too, notwithstanding the fact that the tracing of the story from Sanskrit into a multitude of languages, and from a heathen fable to a Christian legend, has been taken up as a task by specialists, and the whole thing sifted with a freedom that Pentateuchal critics might envy, till it seemed that its kernel and accretions were most absolutely known and severally distinguished.

Naturally, again, the work of Professor Harris would not be complete without revising his translation in the light of the Greek, and Mr. Robinson's giving a tolerably critical edition of the Greek text in the shape recoverable from the fable of Barlaam and Josaphat, with prolegomena, notes, and a critical discussion of the question how far and wherein the Syriac, the Greek and the Armenian present the original Apology of Aristides. Into the detail of this we cannot go here. It seems plain, however, that the Greek has been compressed or excised somewhat, and equally plain that the Syriac has amplified a little. It is likewise plain that we possess the style, as well as the thought and the substance of the original apology, though it may not be possible to say just where a corner has been knocked off or a piece of stucco supplied.

Messrs. Harris and Robinson have each contributed to the special portion of the other, and beautifully exemplified the proverb that two are better than one, as well as the charm of brothers in concord and unity.

The multitude of minor points discussed and illumined and elucidated in this publication, though of exceeding interest, we must pass by. The University of Cambridge in England, and Haverford College in America, are to be most warmly congratulated upon such a brilliant and interesting work; and none the less so are the authors for the scholarship, acumen and patience everywhere exhibited. (8vo, paper, pp. 118, 28. English price, five shillings).

ISAAC H. HALL,  
*New York City.*

---

#### AMIAUD AND SCHEIL'S LES INSCRIPTIONS DE SALMANASAR II.\*

Arthur Amiaud did not live to see this work brought to completion. If he had, this notice would be different in many particulars. Scheil, a student of one year, whom Amiaud associated with him in the work, is responsible for all that

---

\* LES INSCRIPTIONS DE SALMANASAR II. roi d'assyrie (860-824), transcrites, coordonnées, traduites et commentées par A. Amiaud et V. Scheil. Par'is: H. Welter, 1890. Pp. xiv and 120.

is good and bad in this book, and I am forced to say that the good points are few in comparison with the bad.

In the preface, Scheil gives a genealogical table of Shalmaneser, a short history of the different inscriptions of this king, and his reasons for his method of transliteration.\* The connected and accented transliteration is much preferable to the syllabic method, but only in the hands of a person who knows the lexicon and grammar. Scheil does not know either of these and, as a result, his accentuation is very faulty. It would have been much better if he had not attempted to make grammatical forms, for his attempt has been an utter failure. Making all due allowance for very careless proof-reading, there still remain hundreds of words either incorrectly accented or left unaccented. I have counted more than 400 typographical errors on the 120 pages.

In the preface, after noticing the work of his predecessors, Scheil states that the object of this edition of these texts is to bring them to the present status of Assyriological research. Instead of a step forward he has taken two steps backward. His transliterations are based on the printed texts as published in Rawlinson and Layard. In the Monolith Inscription he has made good use of Dr. Craig's emendations as published in his Leipzig dissertation. Why could he not have crossed over to London and collated these texts anew? It is unscientific and useless to put further transliterations and translations upon the market without a thorough collation of the originals. Such must be regarded as only approximately correct, and cannot, in any case, be cited as authoritative. Craig has done much for the Monolith and Throne Inscriptions. Why did not Scheil follow in his steps and fix the texts of these inscriptions for all time, as Lyon has done for some of the Sargon texts? As things stand, another edition of the Shalmaneser texts is needed at once, but an edition based on a thorough revision of the printed texts by a close comparison with the collations of others and a careful study of the originals.

I can notice only a few of his transliterations. We find *apil* and *abil*, and *abil* and *ablu* at the end of proper names, used indiscriminately; *bêlat* and *bêlit*; *tâhazu*, *taḥâzu* and *taḥazu*; *kibrât* and *kibrat*; *adi* and *adî*; *nîribu* and *nirîbu*; *diktu* and *dîktu*; *pan* and *pân*; *ușeziz* and *ușêšiz*; *aḥâveš* and *aḥamiš*; *šuzub* and *šûzub*; *râmanu* and *ramânu*; *tanâti* and *tanati*; *ușâlik* and *ușalik*; *ûbla* and *ubla*; *napasi* and *napâsi*; *abiktu* and *apiktu*; *ûmê* and *umê*; *anaku* and *anâku*; *šadû* and *šâdû*; *elî* and *êlî*; *ubân* and *uban*; *șâbê* and *şabê*. I could multiply examples almost indefinitely. A certain writing is often used consistently in the first part of the book—cf. *aḥamiš*, *adî*, etc. There are no rules for accenting verbal forms. At one time it is *iṭîbu* and then *iṭibu*; *inîru* and *iniru*; *ușâlik* and *ușalik*; *ușêziz* and *ușeziz*; *alik* and *âlik* for *allik* (*al(l)ik*), etc., etc. In some cases the participles are correctly and consistently accented, and in others the accents are just as consistently omitted. The endings *ûtu* and *ânu* are accented or left unaccented at pleasure. The final *i* in the majority of all genitive forms is accented. Scheil has incorporated the 1st per. sg. pronominal suffix into the genitive ending too

---

\* Nous avons cru devoir continuer la méthode de transcription liée et accentuée. Les voyelles, longues de leur nature, où l'accent est suppléé par deux consonnes qui suivent, le portent ou l'omettent indifféremment, par exemple *dikta*, *dîkta*, *ubla*, *ûbla*, etc.

often, but making allowance for such cases, why should *šinni*—and in the construct state—*tukulti*, *karani*, etc., have their final *i* accented? Little attention is paid to the case endings. Where the scribe has designated a given case, it is well to follow him. In the case of ideograms, one should follow the usage as determined by a thorough study of all the inscriptions. As in his edition of the *Šamši-Rammân* text, so here, no clear distinction is made between **𐎶** and **𐎶**, **𐎶**, **𐎶** and **𐎶**, and **𐎶** and **𐎶**. Again such forms as *rîmu* and *rêmu*, *şîru* and *şêru* are not distinguished. The construct state of a noun is seldom indicated, and in the few cases where there is such indication, there is no consistency in usage, e. g., *şulum* and *şulmu* *Šamši*, *Šamaš* and *Šamšu*, etc. In *Šamši-Rammân* it was *pad*, here it is *pat*; but why not *pât*, the only other possible reading and the one generally accepted? Scheil also reads *bût*, *abil* which is Babylonian for the Assyrian *apil*, *şut*, etc.—But nothing more need be said about the transliteration.

The translation is much better than the transliteration. It is, in fact, a comparatively easy task to make a translation of an historical text. Most of the words are well known and the meanings of those which are difficult can be guessed from the context. It is an altogether different thing to transliterate correctly and to explain philologically these difficult words. Scheil has made good use of the context. The notes are of little value. The author has omitted almost all difficult words and constructions. In the case of doubtful words, which are of very rare occurrence, it is always well to cite all the passages in which these words are found and the literature on the subject. Scheil does neither of these. In many cases he leads one to think that he is not acquainted with the literature. The comments given are often too simple and elementary for beginners even. A list of the geographical terms occurring in the inscription is added and it is of great value. The author promises a special work on the geography in the very near future. No glossary is added, but this is just as well, for the author's attempt in his *Šamši-Rammân* was not a success.

In conclusion, I would say that Scheil has not been successful in his object to present an edition of these inscriptions containing all the results of the latest Assyrian scholarship. The preface announces this as his aim. A study of the book will show any one how poorly he has succeeded.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,  
*London.*